

ATTACHMENT 2

HIGH VOLUME OF FINALISTS SCORING METHOD ILLUSTRATION ASSUMING TOTAL AVAILABLE BOARD POINTS OF 400 AND TOTAL AVAILABLE TECHNICAL/FEE SCORE OF 400

	CANDIDATE 1	CANDIDATE 2	CANDIDATE 3	CANDIDATE 4	CANDIDATE 5	CANDIDATE 6
Tech Score	210	300	300	300	300	300
Fee Score	50	100	100	100	100	100
Board Score	400	333	266	199	133	66
Total Score	660	733	666	599	533	466

Total of 6 Finalists: Under current policy, the 400 Board points would be divided by six (for the number of finalists), thereby providing a difference of 66.66 points between each bidder.

Candidate 1 – lowest technical passing score; cost twice as much as lowest bidder; ranked #1 by Board

Candidate 2 – highest technical passing score, highest fee score, ranked #2 by Board

Candidate 3 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #3 by Board

Candidate 4 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #4 by Board

Candidate 5 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #5 by Board

Candidate 6 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #6 by Board

The Board's first choice (Candidate 1) would NOT be selected. In this example, the incremental difference is small and therefore the Board's influence is diluted.

ATTACHMENT 2

LOW VOLUME OF FINALISTS SCORING METHOD ILLUSTRATION ASSUMING TOTAL AVAILABLE BOARD POINTS OF 400 AND TOTAL AVAILABLE TECHNICAL/FEE SCORE OF 400

	CANDIDATE 1	CANDIDATE 2
Tech Score	210	300
Fee Score	50	100
Board Score	400	200
Total Score	660	600

Total of 2 Finalists: Under current policy, the 400 Board points would be divided by two (for the number of finalists), thereby providing a difference of 200 points between each bidder.

Candidate 1 – lowest technical passing score; cost twice as much as lowest bidder; ranked #1 by Board

Candidate 2 – highest technical passing score, highest fee score, ranked #2 by Board

In this example, regardless how low Candidate 1's technical and fee scores are, as the Board's first choice, Candidate 1 would always be selected. The incremental difference is much greater and therefore the Board's influence is greater.